

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12, 17-19 and 21 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

Objection to the Title:

In the Office Action, the title of the invention was objected to because it was not descriptive of the claimed invention. By way of this amendment and reply, a more descriptive title is being provided.

Objection to Abstract:

In the Office Action, the abstract was objected to because it exceeds the one paragraph limit, and because the title was included in the abstract. By way of this amendment and reply, a new abstract is being submitted, which is believed to conform to the M.P.E.P.

Specification Amendments:

In accordance with the request made on page 3 of the Office Action, the specification has been reviewed, and minor amendments have been made. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections:

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 and 17 were objected to because of informalities noted on page 3 of the Office Action. With respect to the issues raised for claim 1, those

issues have been addressed by way of the amendments made to claim 1. As to claim 5, “a mobile computer” is not recited in line 2 of that claim, or in any other line of that claim. Clarification is respectfully requested. As to claim 9, the second occurrence of “a” was corrected by way of a preliminary amendment filed on November 13, 2003.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,968 to Hart. This rejection is traversed with respect to presently pending claims 1-21, for at least the reasons given below.

Hart describes a system for transferring context between a portable computer processor and a docking station processor upon docking and undocking. However, unlike the presently claimed invention, Hart requires a direct physical connection between the portable computer and the docking station, wherein the presently claimed invention according to claim 1 recites a step that detects when a mobile computer is interacting with a base station by wireless communications between the mobile computer and the base station, with the mobile computer and the base station not being directly connected to each other, and which causes the mobile computer to perform a transition from an operating state to another state.

Since Hart does not disclose or suggest such transferring of context information by way of wireless communications when a base station is not directly connected to a mobile computer, Hart cannot anticipate claim 1. Since all of the other presently pending independent claims recite similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, those claims are also not anticipated by Hart.

The presently pending dependent claims are patentable due to the specific features recited in those claims, as well as due to their respective dependency on one of the presently pending independent claims (as discussed above).

For example, claim 6 recites that the mobile computer is capable of entering one of a plurality of different sleep states, and wherein the system context information includes a numeric value indicating which of the plurality of sleep states the mobile computer has entered. Claim 7, which depends from claim 6, recites that the control element is operable to cause the base station to perform the transition to the operating state in accordance with the

system context information by retrieving the system context information from either a single stored file in the mobile computer or a plurality of stored files in the mobile computer, depending upon which of the plurality of different sleep states the mobile computer has entered. Thus, in claim 7, the system context information is retrieved differently by the base station based on which of a plurality of sleep states the mobile computer is in. Such features are not disclosed or suggested by Hart.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 23, 2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer Number: 22879
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

By Phillip J. Articola

William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,819